



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/085,464 | 02/27/2002 | Donald W. Crowe JR. | 01-4951 | 1837 |

7590 04/30/2003
Edward M. Livingston, Esq.
628 Ellen Dr.
P.O. Box 1599
Winter Park, FL 32790

EXAMINER

FETSUGA, ROBERT M

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

3751

6

DATE MAILED: 04/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/085,464

Applicant(s)

CROWE, DONALD W.

Examiner

Robert M. Fetsuga

Art Unit

3751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6 and 8-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3751

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species I in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. Accordingly, claims 6 and 8-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b).

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Proper antecedent basis for the subject matter set forth in claim 3, and the "plurality of diameter lengths" set forth in claim 7, could not be found in the specification. Applicant is reminded claim terminology in mechanical cases should appear in the descriptive portion of the specification by reference to the drawing(s).

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior

Art Unit: 3751

art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DeAngelis.

The DeAngelis reference discloses a toilet flange comprising: an arcuate plate 24 including a bracket (unnumbered, Fig. 4 at top or bottom) having a shank opening/bracket entry (at outer perimeter) and an end wall (Fig. 4, hidden lines); and floor bolt apertures (receiving 26), as claimed. Re claim 7, the "floor bolts" are not set forth as part of the claimed combination, and the DeAngelis floor bolt apertures are capable of receiving floor bolts which would meet the relative size recitation.

5. Claims 1-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeAngelis and Bressler.

Re claim 3, although the DeAngelis fastener plate is not two inches in length, as claimed, attention is directed to the Bressler reference which discloses an analogous fastener plate which further can be less than 180 degrees in extent (col. 3 lns. 42-45). Therefore, in consideration of Bressler, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate a shorter length with the DeAngelis fastener plate in order to facilitate repairing a broken closet flange. The

Art Unit: 3751

choice of specific size would appear an obvious choice to be made depending upon the size of the break, desired strength, etc.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeAngelis and Buchanan, Jr.

To the extent the floor bolt apertures of the DeAngelis toilet flange are not "arcuate", as claimed, attention is directed to the Buchanan, Jr. (Buchanan) reference which discloses an analogous toilet flange which further includes arcuate floor bolt apertures 2. Therefore, in consideration of Buchanan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate elongate apertures with the DeAngelis toilet flange in order to facilitate securement.


7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The Tucker, Stokes and Frank references disclose various toilet flanges having features in common with the instant invention.

8. Applicant is referred to MPEP 714.02 and 608.01(o) in responding to this Office action.

Art Unit: 3751

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert M. Fetsuga at telephone number 703/308-1506 who can be most easily reached Monday through Thursday.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert M. Fetsuga", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Robert M. Fetsuga
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3751